IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO : 1590 of 2004

Between:

1 Anwar-Ul_Uloom Educational Association, New Mallepally, Hyderabad, rep. by its Secretary, Mahaboob Alam Khan.
2 Anwar-Ul-Uloom College of Engineering & Technology, Yennapally, Vikarabad, Ranga Reddy District, rep. by its Secretary Mahaboob Alam Khan.
3 Mahaboob Alam Khan. S/o Nawab Shah Alam Khan, R/o Barakatpura, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1 All Indian Council for Technical Education, Rep. by its Secretary, Indira Gandhi Sports Complex, I.P. Estate, New Delhi.
2 Government of A.P. rep. by its Principal Secretary, Higher Education Department, Secretariat, Saifabad, Hyderabad.
3 The Commissioner and Director of Technical Education, Govt. of A.P., Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ, order, direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not processing and approving the petitioners application for additional courses in the 2nd petitioner institution for the academic year 2004-2005 as being illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional and contrary to the provisions of the AICTE Act, 1987 and the Regulations made thereunder and consequently direct the respondents to approve and grant permission for the additional courses as per the application made by the petitioner to the 2nd petitioner institution for the academic year 2004-2005.

Counsel for the Petitioners : MR. S.NIRANJAN REDDY

Counsel for the 1st respondent : Mr. S.S. Prasad
Counsel for the Respondents 2 & 3 : GP FOR EDUCATION

The Court made the following :

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO.1590 OF 2004

-

ORAL ORDER :

The learned Counsel for the petitioners states that the cause in the writ petition does not survive and therefore no further adjudication is necessary.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

_____

08th December, 2004.

Gbs

To

1 The Secretary, All Indian Council for Technical Education, Indira Gandhi Sports Complex, I.P. Estate, New Delhi.
2 The Principal Secretary, Government of A.P.,
Higher Education Department, Secretariat, Saifabad, Hyderabad.
3 The Commissioner and Director of Technical Education, Govt. of A.P., Hyderabad.

4.2CCs to G.P. for Education, High Court of AP Bldgs, Hyderabad (OUT).

5.2CD copies